DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 251 CE 027 062

AUTHOR De Sanctis, Vincent: Paulsmeyer, David L.
TITLE The National Advisory Council on Adult Education in ABE Policymaking.
PUB DATE 5 Nov 80
NOTE 31p.: Paper presented at the National Adult Education Annual Conference (St. Louis, MO, November 5, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization: *Adult Basic Education: Adult Educators: *Advisory Committees: Agency Cooperation: *Agency Role: Attitudes: Bureaucracy: Educational Cooperation: *Federal Government: Opinions: *Policy Formation: Professional Associations: Public Agencies: Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS *National Advisory Council on Adult Education

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the perceived impact of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education on policy making in adult basic education (ABE), and incidentally, to examine the role of federal advisory committees. After a review of the literature, two questionnaires were developed and sent to past and present Council members and several categories of adult educators who were thought to be familiar with the Council's activities. These educators included state directors of adult education, professors of adult education, past presidents of several adult education professional associations, and members of the professional staff of the U.S. Office of Education's Division of Adult Education. In addition, some interviews were conducted. Analysis of the data generated indicates that division staff, state directors, and some professional groups are more likely to be familiar with the Council and rate the Council higher on its impact and the utility of its reports than some other groups or faculty members. The data show that constituents' perceptions form a clear-cut pattern: degree of familiarity with Council, utility of Council reports, and degree of Council impact. This pattern does not extend to include the same degree of agreement about characteristic functions of the Council. These findings suggest that an advisory council may be able to maintain support because of its constituents' familiarity with staff, purpose, and members rather than through its activities. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198251

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ADULT EDUCATION IN ABE POLICYMAKING

A Paper Presented to the

National Adult Education Annual Conference
St. Louis, Missouri
November 5, 1980

by

Vincent De Sanctis, Ed.D.
Department of Secondary Education

and

David L. Paulsmeyer, Ph.D.
Department of Government and Public Affairs

Assistant Professors
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Edwardsville, Illinois 62026

CE027062

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Vincent De Sanctis
David L. Paulsmeyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ADULT EDUCATION IN ABE POLICYMAKING

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The federal government has long used a variety of advisory bodies and systems to gather information and provide opportunities for ideas to emerge from non-governmental sources so that more effective decisions can be made. But it was only with the passage of much of the social legislation of the mid and late sixties that more permanent advisory bodies were created. Several reasons have been advanced for their creation. For example, Rubin (12) has identified intense interest in citizen participation by Congressmen and others. Michel (8) referred to the encouragement of the Johnson administration while Stenberg (15) argued that congressional mistrust of state and local agencies could be partially resolved through advisory committees. As of 1980 the federal government had some 820 permanent advisory committees spending an estimated $88,000,000. The Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 has provided for a great deal of information about the number, composition and costs of federal advisory committees. But, with only a handful of exceptions, few systematic attempts have been made to analyze what advisory committees do and the role and impact they may have in policymaking.

Adult basic education (ABE) is one of the many federal programs with legislation that mandates an advisory council.

Although established in the 1970 adult education legislation, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education (hereafter referred to as the Council) is as little known as its numerous counterparts. Yet, its creation and continued support is undoubtedly an indication that there is some expectation on the part of some actors that it has a role to play in the adult basic education policymaking process. But, what that role is and how effective the Council has been at performing it is not well known.

The purpose of this paper is to offer an analysis of the Council's role and impact in ABE policymaking as perceived by past Council members and to compare their perceptions to those of adult educators. As far as can be determined the few investigations of federal advisory committees have been restricted to an analysis of current members' perceptions of role and impact. This study has compared past and present members' views with those of a representative sample of the universe of adult educators potentially knowledgeable about the Council and its work.

One explanation for the continued use of and support for the Council can be found in its role in the ABE subgovernment. As a small group of federal executives, legislators and interest groups in ABE policymaking have coalesced into a sub-government (or "iron triangle'), the Council has been able to maintain a facilitative role among the three major actors: congressional subcommittees, federal bureaucracy, and such interest groups as the National Asso-

ciation for Public School Continuing Adult Educators (NAPCAE) and the Adult Education Association (AEA) (De Sanctis and Paulsmeyer 4).

The Council's influence in ABE policymaking may depend upon how effective it is in the eyes of key constituents. One hypothesis is that through its major activities of advising and reporting the Council can gain (or presumably lose) support it needs from constituents. This hypothesis assumes that the Council is visible to its constituents in that they are minimally familiar with the Council and that familiarity is related to positive rather than negative perceptions. This proposition is the major one to be analyzed in this paper.

Additionally it may be hypothesized that the degree of congruence between Council members' and constituents' perceptions about the Council may identify sources of stress in ABE policymaking and the role of the Council in the ABE subgovernment. Presumably the more agreement there is among Council members and constituents about Council member's roles, Council functions and Council impact on ABE policymaking, the more effective the Council may be in the ABE subgovernment. Conversely, different views and ratings of Council performance may in turn lead to unmet expectations about the Council and subsequently a loss of credibility in ABE policymaking. This argument is examined by comparing perceptions of Council members and constituents on characteristics of Council impact.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Systematic studies of federal advisory committees have been few in number. It was only in the late 1960s that any concerted attention was directed to advisory committees. One issue identified was that of elitism. Several studies (House 17; Cronin and Thomas 3; and Kluempke 6) discovered that members more often than not were the socially and economically elite and non-representative of the general public.

A second finding to emerge was that advisory councils were unknown to the public and tended to operate with minimal administrative control (House 18; Senate 19). The Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, an attempt to remedy this deficiency, has subsequently required an annual report on all federal advisory committees (U.S. President, 20).

Serving as an alternative source of information to the federal policymaking system (Spector 14; Kluempke 6; Thomas 16; Lee 7) was a third characteristic identified. As Kluempke has noted "Advisory councils are an indication that federal officials realize that they don't have a monopoly on information and ideas -- they provide the means by which the government can acquire the services of able, knowledgeable, and dedicated citizens at a relatively nominal cost" (6:491).

A fourth characteristic that emerged from these few studies was a lack of knowledge as to the impact of councils (Cronin and Thomas 3; Comptroller General 2; and Kluempke 6).

In fact, Kluempke observed that the council members in his study were not particularly impressed with their perceptions of impact.

In addition to the above evidence, federal advisory councils, viewed from another perspective, appeared to be extensions of vested interest groups' persisting desire to increase their access to the policymaking process and thereby change from outsiders to insiders (Presthus, 11; Sowell, 13). For example, when the Carter Administration sought to reduce or eliminate federal advisory committees, former Commissioner of Education Ernest Boyer characterized committee supporters as "parties at interest" (Boyer, 1).

The few studies done of federal advisory councils have focused almost exclusively on either members' perceptions of performance and impact (Cronin and Thomas, 3, and Kluempke, 6) or degree of adherence to administrative guidelines (House, 18; Comptroller General, 2). The evidence from these studies suggested that councils were co-opted by their respective subgovernments. If these findings were accurate then it appeared fruitful to investigate the degree of familiarity, perceptions of impact, and assessments of usefulness of advisory council publications held by other actors in the policymaking process, particularly those actors most responsible for the creation and maintenance of councils.

Councils were created through a combination of interest groups' support and congressional willingness to insure (at least symbolically) some level of citizen participation in the policymaking

process. As Sowell (13) has suggested, Congress undoubtedly surmised that true citizen participation was prohibitively expensive, unrealistic and that councils served as less expensive vehicles for knowledge acquisition. Advisory councils resulted from legislative trade-offs between citizen participation and acceptable costs for such involvement. Those most privy to these trade-offs - the organized interest groups - were also most likely to have their representatives appointed to membership. Advisory councils serve, in Presthus' words, as one of the "currencies of interaction" between vested interest groups and the federal bureaucracy. This increasingly common phenomenon has eroded the 1960s emphasis on the general public's involvement.

METHODOLOGY

Although informative about members' perspectives on the roles of advisory councils, previous studies have not systematically examined the views of key constituents of advisory councils. Thusly, two questionnaires were developed for this study. First, a member questionnaire was designed based on several questions used in both the Cronin and Thomas (3) and Kluempke (6) studies and sent to previous and present Council members. Between January, 1971 and August, 1979, thirty-seven individuals took the oath of office. (Two additional appointees resigned before taking the oath). A total of 23 members (62 percent) returned questionnaires. A second questionnaire incorporating many of the same questions was sent to several categories of adult educators who were thought to be suffi-

ciently aware of the Council's purpose and general activities to provide a good comparison to Council member responses. The adult education community surveyed included: 57 state directors of adult education (State Directors), 175 professors of adult education in United States' colleges and universities (names obtained from the 1978 membership list of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education) (Faculty), the 17 individuals who served between 1971 and 1979 as President of either the National Association of Public Continuing Adult Education (NAPCAE) or the Adult Education Association (AEA) plus their two current executive directors (NAPCAE/AEA), some 38 individuals who either served since 1971 as President of the Coalition of Adult Education Organizations (CAEO) or were members of the National Council of Urban Administrators of Adult Education (URBAN), and 17 members of the professional staff of the U.S. Office of Education's Division of Adult Education (now the Office of Adult Learning) (Division Staff). In the ABE iron triangle the latter represented in this study the bureaucrats while the former were representative of the interest groups.

The respondents by category were as follows: State Directors 43 out of 57 (75 percent), NAPCAE/AEA presidents and executive directors 19 out of 19 (100 percent), college and university Faculty 98 of 175 (56 percent), the U.S.O.E. Division Staff 11 of 17 (65 percent), and CAEO/URBAN 20 of 38 (53 percent). As a group the adult educators had a response rate of 190 of 306 (or 62 percent).

To supplement the mailed questionnaires several individuals were interviewed in Washington, D.C., including two congressional aides, an association executive director, an executive director of an education lobbying organization, an official from Health, Education and Welfare, an official from the Office of Education's Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education and the executive director of the Council. Finally, several documentary sources were reviewed including: minutes of some 45 Council meetings conducted between 1971 and June 1979, and some 24 Council publications issued during the same period. The data were gathered in the Summer and Fall of 1979.

RESULTS

The Council's influence (or that of other similar advisory bodies) depends in part upon how effective it is viewed in the opinions of key constituents. At one extreme the advisory body may be seen as ineffectual, having no impact in policymaking, or not doing much of anything, including publishing reports, which is useful for constituents. At the other extreme, the constituents might rate the advisory body as having an impact on legislative and executive issues and producing useful reports for them. Of course, these possibilities in turn assume some degree of familiarity with the advisory body.

In this study, awareness of the Council (Familiarity), impact of the Council in ABE policymaking (Impact), utility of Council publications for adult educators (Reports, and characteristic activities of the Council (Functions) are operationalized

from responses to the questions shown in Table 1. Table 1 also displays the responses for the five groups of attentive constituents. An examination of that data reveals some considerable difference

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

in responses among the groups of the Council's attentive constituents. Generally the findings indicate that Division Staff, State Directors, and NAPCAE/AEA groups are more likely to be familiar with all four aspects of the Council, rate the Council high on its impact and the utility of its reports than CAEO/URBAN or lastly Faculty members. A more detailed discussion of these findings suggests that attentive constituents' closeness or "proximity" to the Council's work influences their responses (De Sanctis and Paulsmeyer, 5).

As expected, responses to these questions are related, and form discernable dimensions of how constituents view the Council. In particular, the attitudes and perspectives of members of the adult education community toward the Council can be described in terms of a single factor and three sub-factors or dimensions. The major factor measures "Council Effect". That is, members of the adult education community who are more familiar with the Council are also more likely to give the Council high marks for its impact on legislative and executive leaders in the national government and the utility of Council reports and publications for adult educators. And, the converse of those relationships is also evident in these data, i.e., those adult educators less familiar with the Council are

less likely to give the Council high ratings on impact and utility of Council reports. As shown in Table 2, results of the factor analysis reveal a single dimension (principal components solution) composed of those variables and three subdimensions called Impact, Reports and Familiarity.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Values of ± .500 of coefficients are conventionally considered a significant indication of a variable's relationship to a factor. Every coefficient in the principal components solution (Council-Effect) in Table 2 exceeds that minimum except the one for the Council's perceived impact on the President which is very close with a value of .498. Variables in the three subdimensions of Impact, Reports and Familiarity are all associated with their respective factors with coefficients of .658 or greater.

Adult educators who perceive the Council's impact as more significant on legislation, policy implementation, the President, the U.S. Congress, the Commissioner of Education or the Director of the Division of Adult Education are also likely to highly rate the Council's impact in another area. And, those who envision the Council's impact as lower are likely to rate that impact low on both the executive and legislative branches. Similarly, strong correlations among the responses for variables used to measure the utility of Council reports indicates an underlying dimension of favorable to unfavorable ratings of Council reports among adult educators.

Apparently, as adult educators report more awareness of one aspect of the Council, e.g., Council purpose, they are also likely to report more awareness and familiarity with other aspects of the Council, e.g., reports, Council members or Council staff. This latter dimension of adult educators' views about the Council varies from more to less extensive, self-reported awareness of the Council.

This factor of Council Effect and its sub-dimensions of Impact, Reports and Familiarity do not, however, extend to include agreement about characteristics of the Council. Interestingly whether the Council is perceived to be advisory to the USOE, lobbyist, as making managerial suggestions, reviewing agency rules and regulations, workingon publicity or working out new legislation is relatively independent of how the council is rated vis-a-vis Impact, Familiarity or Report perspectives. This finding is revealed in the factor analysis which includes the responses to questions about six Functions which are or are not characteristic of the Council as well as the Impact, Report and Familiarity variables. In this analysis, the factor loadings of the Function variables does not exceed .400 on the Council-Effect dimension (or principal component), nor do the six Function variables form a sub-dimension when the factor matrix is rotated. One may hypothesize that the adult educators form their opinions about the Council more so on the basis of Council results or effects and less so on the basis of how the Council functions or works to develop reports or influence other actors in ABE policymaking.

To examine intergroup differences in perceptions of the Council, standardized factor scores are generated for each respondent (constituent) from the factor analysis in Table 2. The factor scores are the exact measures of constituents' views of Council Impact, Reports and Familiarity with the Council. In a normal distribution, factor scores would be Z scores with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1.0. In this analysis factor scores for the three subdimensions vary only slightly from Z score norms:

Sub-Dimension		Factor Score
Factor Name	Mean	Standard Deviation
Impact	-.018	.982
Reports	-.023	1.000
Familiarity	-.011	.979

Analysis of variance (Nie, 10) results indicate statistically significant differences in group responses to the Council's impact on policymakers, utility of Council reports and familiarity with the Council. Part A of Table 3 includes the factor score mean and standard deviation for each attentive constituent group on each subdimension of Council-Effects and the F-Ratio from the respective analysis of variance tests. Part B of Table 3 summarizes the groups' relative rank based on its respective mean factor score, e.g., State Directors were more likely to give the Council more credit for having an impact on policymakers (mean= -.436, rank 1) than Division Staff (mean=-.404, rank 2), CAEO/URBAN

(mean=-.179, rank 3), NAPCAE/AEA (mean=.127, rank 4) or Faculty (mean=.204, rank 6).

Insert Table 3 About Here

As measured by the standard deviation, dispersion around the factor score means suggests the degree of homogeneity within each of the Council's attentive constituents. Albeit a small group, nearly 70% (68.2%) of the Division Staff members' perspectives on Council Impact and Familiarity fall within relatively narrow ranges from the group's mean ± .747 and ± .514 respectively, in comparison with the other groups. Alternately, other groups exhibit more heterogeneity in their members' responses to Council Impact and Familiarity, e.g. on the Impact and Familiarity subdimensions to the CAEO/URBAN group standard deviations are ±1.053 and ± 1.004, respectively. NAPCAE/AEA members display less dispersion in their views on the utility of Council Reports (± .695) than any other group. And, about 70% of the CAEO/URBAN members ratings of the utility of Council Reports fall within the largest range ± 1.170 from the CAEO/URBAN mean.

On the one hand the data suggest that most members of each group (68.2%) perceive the Council within a relatively narrow range (standard deviations do not exceed 1.1). On the other hand the significant group differences suggest that the Council does not enjoy uniformly favorable ratings among important constituent groups.

Finally, it is argued that Council effectiveness partially depends upon how closely Council members views are shared by its attentive constituents. In the one extreme Council members and constituents might not share opinions and in the other extreme there would be no differences (or complete congruence) between Council members and their constituents. Although neither extreme is expected, Council and attentive constituents degree of congruence can be measured to provide an indication of which groups are more or less likely to share perspectives with the Council members.

A rough indicator of Council-Attentive Constituent congruence on issues was developed from Council and Attentive Constituent estimates of Council impact on policymaking at the national level. As shown in Table 4, Council members are unan-

Insert Table 4 About Here

imous in rating their impact on legislation as significant or moderate. Ninety-three percent of the State Directors also gave the Council significant or moderate impact ratings on legislation. So for these purposes, the Council-State Director difference is 7%, less than that for any other group. Each attentive constituent group rating is so calculated for each area of Council impact. The several ratings are shown in Part A and summarized in Part B of Table 4.

For the Council to be an effective element in the policymaking process, as hypothesized, there should be evidence of a

high degree of congruence between members' perceptions of impact and other attentive constituents' perceptions. The data in Table 4 reveal that State Directors have the highest degree of congruence with Council members in five of the seven areas of Impact (Legislation, Attentive Constituents, Policy Implementation, and Commissioner of Education) and a close second in the other two areas of Impact (Director of the Division and Congress). The Division Staff, the bureaucrats, are first in congruence in one area of Impact (Congress) and second in four other areas of Impact (Legislation, Director of the Division, Policy Implementation, and President). The NAPCAE/AEA leadership ranked highest in congruence on the Director of the Division but fell in the middle range on all the others. Apparently the high interest level in the ABE program by the NAPCAE leadership (an organization composed primarily of public school adult educators) is neutralized to a great extent by the AEA leadership which has a constituency with a broader range of interests. The CAEO/URBAN group tends to be found in the middle range undoubtedly reflecting the diverse concerns that would interest the presidents of CAEO and the local URBAN administrators. Finally, and probably not surprising, Faculty are found to consistently have the least agreement with Members on Impact. As a group Faculty are most remote from the policymaking process and are least likely to have knowledge of impact. An alternative explanation could be that their lack of interaction with Council members, staff and activities prevents them from developing shared views. These findings reveal that Council

members perceptions are most congruent with State Directors (13.3% average variation) and the Division Staff (19.0% average variation), the most concerned interest group and bureaucratic agency, respectively.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The data suggest some justification for examining the context in which the some 800 federal advisory bodies operate. This context would include members of the "Iron triangle" i.e., Congressional subcommittee members, bureaucrats, and interest groups. The survey data in this study provide information on bureaucratic and interest group perspectives on the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. These data have been supplemented with information obtained on the relationship of the Council to key congressional subcommittees.

With respect to the survey data, the findings indicate that far from a random perspective attentive constituents' perceptions form a clear cut pattern. In this study that pattern includes: degree of familiarity with Council, utility of Council reports, and degree of Council impact. This pattern does not extend to include the same degree of agreement about characteristic functions of the Council.

These findings suggest than an advisory council may be able to develop and maintain constituent support (hence enhance council influence) because of its impact rather than its "process". By performance in this study, reference is made to the high intercorre-

lations among variables that measured Council performance, i.e., dimensions of Council impact and reports. This understanding of Council performance (as hypothesized) is inextricably related to constituents familiarity with major features of the Council, including staff, purpose, members. By process in this study, reference is made to the activities of the Council in terms of Council time devoted to lobbying, making managerial suggestions, reviewing regulations and guidelines, or working on new legislation.

Attentive constituents in this study perceive this Council as having more than a symbolic role. The Council's fate is inescapably intertwined with the needs and goals of interest groups having the closest proximity to the ABE policymaking process. The data clearly support the notion, to varying degrees, that the National Advisory Council on Adult Education is one of the interest groups' links to the ABE policymaking process. These findings are strengthened it is believed because, unlike earlier studies, Council members' perceptions are compared with members of selected interest groups rather than relying on Council members' individual self-report.

REFERENCES

1. Boyer, Ernest. "HEW Advisory Committees, the Results of a Departmental Review Conducted Pursuant to OMB Circular A-63," March, 1977.

2. Comptroller General of the United States. Better Evaluations Needed to Weed Out Useless Federal Advisory Committees. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, April 7, 1977.

3. Cronin, Thomas E. and Thomas, Norman C. "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent." Science 171 (February 26, 1971), 771-779.

4. De Sanctis, Vincent and Paulsmeyer, David L. "Adult Basic Education As A Subgovernment" (Unpublished paper). August 1980.

5. De Sanctis, Vincent and Paulsmeyer, David L. "The National Advisory Council on Adult Education: A Descriptive Analysis." Paper presented at the Lifelong Learning Research Conference, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, February 1, 1980. (ERIC doc. No. ED 183 726).

6. Kluempke, Gerald J. "A Descriptive Analysis of the Attitudes, Functions and Utilization of Advisory Council to the United States Office of Education" in To Amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act P.L. 92-463. Hearings before the U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, 94th Cong., 2d sess., 1976.

7. Lee, Charles. Executive Director. Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, Washington, D.C. Interview, 1 August 1979.

8. Michel, George J. "Success in National Educational Policy from Eisenhower to Carter." Peabody Journal of Education 57 (July 1980), 223-232.

9. National Advisory Council on Adult Education. A Report to the President of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 1979.

10. Nie, Norman et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

11. Prasthus, Robert. Elites in the Policy Process. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

12. Rubin, Lillian B. "Maximum Feasible Participation: The Origins, Implications and Present Status." Annals 385 (September 1969), 14-29.

13. Sowell, Thomas. Knowledge and Decisions. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1980.

14. Spector, Manes. "Involving Clients and the Public in Federal Administration through Advisory Committees" in Federal Contributions to Management, edited by David S. Brown. New York: Praeger, 1971. Pp. 16-43.

15. Stenberg, Carl W. "Federalism in Transition: 1959-79." The Grantmanship Center News 8 (May/June 1980), 57-67.

16. Thomas, Norman C. Education in National Politics. New York: David McKay Co., 1975.

17. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Study of the United States Office of Education. H. Doc. 193, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

18. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. The Role and Effectiveness of Federal Advisory Committees. H. Rept. 91-1731, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970.

19. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Operations. The Federal Advisory Committee Act. S. Rept. 92-1098, 92nd Cong., 2d sess., 1972.

20. U.S. President. Federal Advisory Committees. Eighth Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 1980.

TABLE 1: ATTENTIVE CONSTITUENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ADULT EDUCATION

Perspective		DIVISION STAFF (n=11)	STATE DIRECTORS (n=43)	NAPCAE/ AEA (n=19)	CAEO/ URBAN (n=20)	FACULTY (n=98)
Familiarity (% high familiarity)						
Please indicate the nature and extent of your awareness of the Council's work. (1) high familiarity, (2) moderate familiarity, (3) some familiarity, (4) not familiar	Council publications	64%	71%	65%	18%	26%
	Member of the Council	27%	29%	38%	18%	6%
	Staff of the Council	46%	48%	71%	18%	15%
	Purpose of the Council	82%	56%	53%	47%	21%
Impact (% significant - moderate)						
Would you note your perception of the Council's impact on the following areas as (1) significant, (2) moderate, (3) limited, (4) none yet	Legislation	91%	93%	63%	60%	42%
	Policy implementation	64%	76%	58%	55%	28%
	The President	18%	29%	16%	20%	13%
	The U.S. Congress	82%	78%	32%	45%	17%
	The U.S. Commissioner of Education	55%	63%	37%	60%	30%
	Director of the U.S.O.E. Division of Adult Education	73%	73%	74%	65%	56%
	Attentive Constituents (e.g. State Directors, Association staff, college/university faculty)	64%	83%	74%	70%	33%

Table 1 continued

Perspective		DIVISION STAFF (n=11)	STATE DIRECTORS (n=43)	NAPCAE/ AEA (n=19)	CAEO/ URBAN (n=20)	FACULTY (n=98)
Reports (% excellent - good)						
The Council issues Annual Reports as well as special reports. How would you rate the following reports as to their value to you as an adult educator? (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) very good, (5) excellent, (6) not familiar	Annual Reports	73%	90%	84%	65%	68%
	A Target Population in Adult Educ.	73%	88%	90%	70%	59%
	A Historical Perspective: The Adult Educ. Act 1964-74	82%	88%	79%	70%	60%
	Adult Education Future and Amendments (1978)	73%	91%	84%	75%	42%
	An Assessment of the Federal Adult Education Program (1978)	82%	91%	84%	75%	41%
Functions (% characteristic)						
These are many functions characteristic of advisory councils. Are the following functions (1) characteristic or (2) not characteristic of the Council. If you have no opinion mark (3).	Advise on U.S.O.E. program priorities	82%	88%	100%	80%	88%
	Do lobbying work	91%	73%	74%	35%	61%
	Make managerial decisions	55%	46%	42%	35%	30%
	Review guidelines and regulations	100%	100%	95%	80%	82%
	Work on publicity and support	91%	90%	74%	75%	67%
	Work out new legislation	91%	83%	63%	65%	57%

TABLE 2: COUNCIL-EFFECT AND SUB-DIMENSIONS OF IMPACT, REPORT AND FAMILIARITY[a]

	Principal Component	Sub-Dimensions		
Familiarity with Council	Council-Effect	Impact	Report	Familiarity
Publications	.715	.170	-3.50	.778
Members	.651	.312	-.136	.726
Staff	.620	.123	-.262	.750
Purpose	.710	.184	-.270	.842
Impact of Council on				
Legislation	.817	.691	-.364	.334
Policy implementation	.765	.659	-.337	.303
President	.498	.712	-.145	-.057
Congress	.762	.728	-.338	.213
Commissioner of Education	.682	.811	-.167	.152
Director, Division of Adult Education	.669	.765	-.125	.230
Others (State Directors, Associations, Faculty)	.690	.658	-.239	.269
Utility of Council Reports				
Annual	-.740	-.226	.699	-.363
Target	-.738	-.271	.702	-.304
Historical	-.700	-.151	.720	-.354
Future	-.745	-.317	.802	-.147
Assessment	-.744	-.301	.810	-.158
% of total variation in the interrelationships among the 16 variables		50%	10.9%	7.3%
Cumulative % variance		50%	60.9%	68.2%

[a]Factor coefficients range from -1.0 to +1.0.

TABLE 3: ATTENTIVE CONSTITUENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON SUBDIMENSIONS OF IMPACT, REPORTS AND FAMILIARITY: FACTOR SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

PART A

Sub-dimension	Constituent Groups: Division Staff	State Directors	NAPCAE/ AEA	CAEO/ URBAN	Faculty	Analysis of Variance: F-Ratio (Significance)
Impact:						
Mean[a]	-.404	-.436	.127	-.179	.204	4.025
Standard Deviation	.747	.889	.865	1.053	.990	(p .004)
Reports:						
Mean[b]	.049	.497	.517	-.033	-.351	7.777
Standard Deviation	.862	.791	.695	1.170	.985	(p .000)
Familiarity:						
Mean[a]	-.607	-.419	-.381	.325	.231	6.6164
Standard Deviation	.514 (n=11)	.912 (n=41)	.887 (n=19)	1.004 (n=20)	.962 (n=97)	(p .000)

PART B

Sub-dimension	RANK OF EACH GROUP'S MEAN FACTOR SCORE: MOST 1	2	3	4	LEAST 5
Impact	State Dir.	Div. Staff	CAEO/URBAN	NAPCAE/AEA	Faculty
Reports	NAPCAE/AEA	State Dir.	Div. Staff	CAEO/URBAN	Faculty
Familiarity	Div. Staff	State Dir.	NAPCAE/AEA	Faculty	CAEO/URBAN

[a] Lower (negative) scores on the Impact and Familiarity sub-dimension indicate perceptions of more impact and familiarity and higher (positive) scores indicate perceptions of less impact and familiarity.

[b] Higher (positive) scores on the Report sub-dimension indicate more useful reports and lower (negative) scores less useful reports.

TABLE 4: DEGREE OF CONGRUENCE BETWEEN COUNCIL MEMBERS AND ATTENTIVE CONSTITUENT GROUPS

PART A

Impact on	Council Members (%Significant-Moderate)	DEGREE OF CONGRUENCE MOST---LEAST (Group percentage difference from Council members)				
Legislation	100%	State Directors (7%)	Division Staff (9%)	NAPCAE/ AEA (37%)	CAEO/ URBAN (40%)	Faculty (58%)
Dir. Div. of Ad. Ed.	96%	NAPCAE/ AEA (22%)	Division Staff State Directors (23%)		CAEO/ URBAN (31%)	Faculty (40%)
Attentive Constituents	96%	State Directors (13%)	NAPCAE/ AEA (22%)	CAEO/ URBAN (26%)	Division Staff (32%)	Faculty (63%)
Congress	91%	Division Staff (9%)	State Directors (13%)	CAEO/ URBAN (46%)	NAPCAE/ AEA (59%)	Faculty (74%)
Policy Implementation	90%	State Directors (14%)	Division Staff (26%)	NAPCAE/ AEA (32%)	CAEO/ URBAN (35%)	Faculty (62%)
U.S. Comm. of Ed.	83%	State Directors (20%)	CAEO/ URBAN (23%)	Division Staff (28%)	NAPCAE/ AEA (46%)	Faculty (53%)

Table 4 Continued

Impact on	Council Members (% Significant-Moderate)	DEGREE OF CONGRUENCE MOST----------LEAST (Group percentage difference from Council members)				
President	26%	State Directors	Division Staff CAEO/ URBAN		NAPCAE/ AEA	Faculty
		(-3%)	(6%)		(10%)	(13%)

PART B

Summary of Attentive Groups' Degree of Congruence with Council Members

MOST----------LEAST

RANK	State Directors	Division Staff	CAEO/ URBAN	NAPCAE/ AEA	Faculty
Average Percent Difference	13.3%	19.0%	29.6%	32.6%	47.6%